

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

Plaintiff(s), Candidate for the Oval Office
 RENE ORTIZ, PAG, U.S. Marine Combat Veteran Represented by
 Department of Veterans Affairs, (VA), Commandant of the Marine Corps,
 The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE)
 Veterans of Foreign Wars, (VFW)
 The United States Attorneys General, Sacramento Office (USAG) an official
 The Law Offices of "Alpha Zulu" (Undisclosed due to Confidentiality & Privacy)

El Municipio de Sáric Sonora México,
 El Estado de Sonora, México,
 Estados Unidos Mexicanos:

Joseph R. Biden Jr., President of the United States
 Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo President of Mexico
 Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States

Attorneys/representative(s) for Plaintiff(s)/and Representative(s):

U.S. Attorney General of the United States, Merrick B. Garland
 Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP:

Attorneys- Stephen Heald Turner #89627 Email: stephen.turner@lewisbrisbois.com;
 Larissa Guerrero Nefulda #201903, Email: larissa.nefulda@lewisbrisbois.com

Attorneys, Tutelary, Caretaker for Plaintiff(s), Veteran, and/or Fiduciary

Maria Del Socorro Ortiz

Camille Stroughter
 Oakland VA Regional Office Counsel

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
 United States Attorney

W. DEAN CARTER
 Assistant United States Attorney
 E-mail: dean.carter@usdoj.gov
 Telephone: (916) 554-2781
 Facsimile: (916) 554-2900

JOSEPH B. FRUEH
 Assistant United States Attorney
 E-mail: joseph.frueh@usdoj.gov
 Telephone: (916) 554-2702
 501 I Street, Suite 10-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814

FILED	LODGED
RECEIVED	COPY
DEC 31 2024	
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY	DEPUTY

REM

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT
OF APPEALS;**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA,**

**IN THE UNITED STATES EASTERN
DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
SACRAMENTO, &**

**THE VETERANS COURT OF VETERANS'
APPEAL FOR VETERANS' CLAIMS**

Ortiz et al.,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

The United States of America et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL
Case No. CV-24-3304-PHX-KML
Case No. CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL
Case No. CV-24-2417-PHX-JAT

Case No. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR

2:19-CV-2089-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2090-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2094-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2098-TLN-DB
2:21-CV-1221-KJM-CKD

9TH CIRCUIT COURT DOCKET NO.
24-4001/24-5645/24-1369 (SF)

CAVC DOCKET NO. 190815-24143
Case 24-4746 (VA Ct)

VBA DOCKET NO. 240318-450321
(VBA)

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

****NOTICE TO CLERKS OF THE COURTS
RE: APPELLANTS PETITION/NOTICE OF
APPEAL ****

****THIS PETITION (STEP ONE GRIEVANCE,
REQUEST MAST, 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT
OF PETITION) IS FILED IAW THE 1ST
AMENDMENT, MASTER AGREEMENT
BETWEEN VA & AFGE, 2023, THE UCMJ &
RELEVANT CASE LAW(S). NO FILING FEE
OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE
IMPOSED ON THE PETITIONER(S). AS
THEY ARE EXERCISING THEIR
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE
IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS****

To:

Debra D. Lucas, Clerk of the Court for the District Court of Arizona
Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

Case Nos.:

District Court for the District of Arizona:

CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL; CV-24-3304-PHX-KML; CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL; CV-24-2417-
PHX-JAT

Eastern District Court of California, Sacramento:

2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR; 2:19-CV-2089-TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-2090-TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-2094-
TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-2098-TLN-DB; 2:21-CV-01221-KJM-CKD

Ninth Circuit Court Docket Nos.:

24-4001, 24-5645, 24-1369;

Court of Appeals Veterans Claims Docket No. 190815-24143; Case No. 24-4746;
Veterans Board of Appeals - VBA Docket No. 240318-450321

Clerks of the Courts,

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 I, Rene Ortiz, respectfully submit this communication, in a pleading, regarding the above-
2 referenced cases and appeals. My purpose is to challenge the imposition of court fees, which I
3 believe are unlawful. Under no circumstances will I pay these fees, nor will I accept any form
4 of extortion or intimidation by the Court, defendants, or any defense attorneys.

5 To clarify, I am not appealing the courts' rulings, decisions, or opinions, nor the arguments or
6 defenses presented by the defendants. My appeal solely addresses the charging or extortion of
7 fees to proceed with my cases or appeals.

8 The only action I seek from the Court and defendants/appellees is for a judge to initial and
9 sign my Notice of Relief/VA Claim—nothing more.

10 Accordingly:

- 11 1. To Clerk Debra D. Lucas: Please process my Notice of Appeal directly to the Supreme
12 Court, bypassing the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.
- 13 2. To Clerk Molly C. Dwyer: Please process my appeal to the Supreme Court and note
14 that I am appealing the unlawful imposition of fees. Additionally, please forward my case
15 to the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims under Case No. 190815-24143 (Appeal Case
16 No. 24-4746) and to the Veterans Board of Appeals under VBA Docket No. 240318-
17 450321.

18 This matter pertains to and IS a VA claim under Title 38 - Veterans Benefits, which
19 explicitly prohibits the collection of fees in such cases per the statute and court rules. My VA
20 claim and appeal assert that:

- 21 • No one may collect an unlawful debt in violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices
22 Act (FDCPA), Racketeering Influence Corruption Organization Act (RICO) and Title 38
23 Veterans Benefits.
- 24 • No entity outside the VA may grant or deny VA benefits, in violation of Title 38 and
25 the Master Agreement between the VA and AFGE.
- 26 • No one may report inaccurate information on public or private records in violation of
27 the Fair Credit Reporting Act and Title 38 (FCRA).

28 The Court's "arguments" regarding "frivolous lawsuits," lack of subject matter jurisdiction,
or failure to state a claim are irrelevant to my current case/appeal. I am not nor was required

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 to argue the merits of my case/appeal in this or any context when the Defendant default and
2 fail and/or refuse to plead a defense. The only Rule I had to comply with is FRCP Rule 1 - file
3 a solid complaint/VA claim whereupon defense counsel(s) and the court was required to
4 practice and judge the law not practice the law behind the bench and not circumvent the law
5 to excuse the unlawful conduct of the defendants. As petitioner of my case(s) I was required
6 to comply with Rule 1 and the defendants had the opportunity to utilized FRCP and Local
7 Rule 2 to 999. The defendants and court concentrated on my inexperience as a litigator.

8 I further demand that the Clerks of the Courts- the Court, serve my Notice of Appeal to U.S.
9 Government leaders, as outlined in my filing, and obtain their signatures as acknowledgment
10 of receipt- before it is filed as record of the case/appeal. While I do not require their review or
11 a response, I seek to communicate solely with the Inspector General of the U.S. Government
12 regarding my concerns about systemic corruption within our democratic process and our
13 judicial system.

14 Please ensure my appeal is processed as follows:

- 15 1. Serve the Notice of Appeal and obtain acknowledgment of receipt by U.S.
16 Government leadership, especially its' Inspector Generals.
- 17 2. File the appeal with the appropriate court.
- 18 3. Send compliance and obedience to my orders.

19 All I require is the initialing and signing of my Notice of Relief/VA Claim by a Judge and the
20 Defendants/Appellees, in Court or the choice of location of the Defendants/Judge!

21 Thank you for your prompt attention to this urgent matter.

22 Dated this 30th day of December 2024.

23 Respectfully submitted,

24 

25 *El Sariqueño*

26 Rene Ortiz, United States Marine, Combat Veteran
27
28

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 Plaintiff(s), Candidate for the Oval Office
2 RENE ORTIZ, PAG, U.S. Marine Combat Veteran Represented by
3 Department of Veterans Affairs, (VA), Commandant of the Marine Corps,
4 The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE)
5 Veterans of Foreign Wars, (VFW)
6 The United States Attorneys General, Sacramento Office (USAG) an official
7 The Law Offices of "Alpha Zulu" (*Undisclosed due to Confidentiality & Privacy*)

8 El Municipio de Sáric Sonora México,
9 El Estado de Sonora, México,
10 Estados Unidos Mexicanos:

11 Joseph R. Biden Jr., President of the United States
12 Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo President of Mexico
13 Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States

14 Attorneys/representative(s) for Plaintiff(s)/and Representative(s):

15 U.S. Attorney General of the United States, Merrick B. Garland
16 Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP:

17 Attorneys- Stephen Heald Turner #89627 Email: stephen.turner@lewisbrisbois.com;
18 Larissa Guerrero Nefulda #201903, Email: larissa.nefulda@lewisbrisbois.com

19 Attorneys, Tutelary, Caretaker for Plaintiff(s), Veteran, and/or Fiduciary

20 Maria Del Socorro Ortiz

21 Camille Stroughter
22 Oakland VA Regional Office Counsel

23 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
24 United States Attorney

25 W. DEAN CARTER
26 Assistant United States Attorney
27 E-mail: dean.carter@usdoj.gov
28 Telephone: (916) 554-2781
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900

JOSEPH B. FRUEH
Assistant United States Attorney
E-mail: joseph.frueh@usdoj.gov
Telephone: (916) 554-2702
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT
OF APPEALS;**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA,**

**IN THE UNITED STATES EASTERN
DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
SACRAMENTO, &**

**THE VETERANS COURT OF VETERANS'
APPEAL FOR VETERANS' CLAIMS**

Ortiz et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

The United States of America et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL
Case No. CV-24-3304-PHX-KML
Case No. CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL
Case No. CV-24-2417-PHX-JAT

Case No. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR

2:19-CV-2089-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2090-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2094-TLN-DB
2:19-CV-2098-TLN-DB
2:21-CV-1221-KJM-CKD

9TH CIRCUIT COURT DOCKET NO.
24-4001/24-5645/24-1369 (SF)

CAVC DOCKET NO. 190815-24143
Case 24-4746 (VA Ct)

VBA DOCKET NO. 240318-450321
(VBA)

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

****PETITION/NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE
SUPREME COURT ****

****THIS PETITION (STEP ONE GRIEVANCE,
REQUEST MAST, 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT
OF PETITION) IS FILED IAW THE 1ST
AMENDMENT, MASTER AGREEMENT
BETWEEN VA & AFGE, 2023, THE UCMJ &
RELEVANT CASE LAW(S).
NO FILING FEE OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS
SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON THE
PETITIONER(S), AS THEY ARE EXERCISING
THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO
PARTICIPATE IN THE DEMOCRATIC
PROCESS****

Date: December 30, 2024

To:

The Honorable Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia
Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

Case Nos.:

District Court for the District of Arizona:
CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL; CV-24-3304-PHX-KML; CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL; CV-24-
2417-PHX-JAT;

Eastern District Court of California, Sacramento:

2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR; 2:19-CV-2089-TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-2090-TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-
2094-TLN-DB; 2:19-CV-2098-TLN-DB; 2:21-CV-01221-KJM-CKD;

Ninth Circuit Court Docket Nos. 24-4001, 24-5645, 24-1369; CAVC Docket No.
190815-24143; Case No. 24-4746; VBA Docket No. 240318-450321

Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court:

1
2 I, Rene Ortiz, representing the Appellants, respectfully petition the Supreme Court to
3 address numerous legal, procedural, and constitutional violations that have prejudiced the
4 Plaintiffs/Appellants in these cases/appeals.
5

6 **1. Negligence and Dereliction of Duties by the Clerk of Court:**

7
8 The Clerk of the Court (District of Arizona) failed to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil
9 Procedure (FRCP) and Local Rules by not issuing Summons or collecting court fees at the
10 time of filing. This procedural failure rendered the Plaintiffs' causes of actions ineffective and
11 unenforceable, violating their constitutional right to petition the government for redress of
12 grievances under the First Amendment.
13
14

15 **2. Unjust Fees Charged to Plaintiff:**

16
17 Despite clearly asserting that the filing constituted a fundamental constitutional right, the
18 Clerk demanded fees without issuing proper Summons, thereby undermining due process and
19 constitutional protections; and the Clerk of the Court of the Ninth Circuit demanded court
20 fees for defective decisions by the lower Court and an incorrect case before the Appellate
21 Court; a simple hearing could have corrected the mistakes, but the Courts refused to hear
22 Appellant;
23
24
25
26
27
28

3. Denial of Due Process:

The Court denied Plaintiffs/Appellants a hearing to address procedural defects caused by the Clerk's and Judge's actions, further depriving Plaintiffs of their rights to due process; and Judge Krissa M. Lanham practicing law behind the bench by arguing for the Defendants case for them and rendering its' own conclusion and decision, in favor of the Defendants, which the Plaintiff considers a great argument if Defendants had file such defense;

Additional Issues Before the Courts:

In Case Nos. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR and related appeals in the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, Plaintiffs/Appellants raise issues regarding:

- The duplication of benefits by creditors, debt buyers, and collectors; and their unlawful collection of unlawful debts.
- The improper granting/denial of VA benefits to unauthorized individuals.
- Reporting of inaccurate information in private and public records.

The lower courts refused to grant hearings or address these significant issues, instead insisting on court fees for filings and pleadings that were inherently defective due to court errors.

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

Relief Requested Before the Supreme Court:

I respectfully request a 15-minute hearing before the Honorable Justices to address these violations. Specifically, I seek the following relief:

- The Court's acknowledgment by initialing and signing of Appellants' Notice of Relief/VA Claim (ECF 73/4; 6) without further review or rendering of decisions of any case(s).
- An order requiring the Veterans Affairs Administration to rectify its actions, reinstate benefits wrongfully reduced, withheld, or denied, and ensure compliance with the law.

Regarding "*Ortiz et al v. U.S. et al*":

The Appellants exercised their constitutional right to participate in the democratic process by petitioning all 50 states to include their names on the 2024 Presidential ballot. This right was unlawfully denied by all States. Appellants request the Supreme Court:

- Nullify the 2016, 2020, and 2024 presidential elections based on fraud, constitutional violations, and procedural irregularities.
- Require all candidates, including the victor of the 2024 election, to prove their eligibility, ensuring they meet/met legal and ethical standards, including but not limited to the absence of criminal history or fraudulent behavior.

To enter an Office of Honor the person must enter with Honor; both candidates were and are dishonorable. The Supreme Court must uphold the Rule of Law otherwise the Court Is corrupted.

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 The Appellant(s) continues to challenge the Supreme Court case Henson vs. Santander
2 Consumer USA Inc., and the 2024 Presidential Election under FRCP Rule 5.1.

3
4
5 **Conclusion**

6 Appellants respectfully request 15 minutes of the Court's time to sign the Notice of Relief,
7 enforce the Rule of Law, and safeguard constitutional protections, ensuring the restoration of
8 due process.
9

10
11 Despite numerous attempts, Appellants have not been granted the opportunity to be heard
12 by the lower courts, executive agencies and departments, state representatives, or local
13 authorities. In light of this, I hereby invoke my constitutional rights to be heard and
14 formally request the following:
15

- 16
17 1. To meet with the leadership of the Judicial, Executive, and Legislative branches of
18 the United States of America on **January 6, 2025, at 3:00 AM in Washington, D.C.**
19
20 2. To first address the Offices of the Inspector Generals on **January 3, 2025, at 13:00 PM.**
21
22 3. To meet with Appellant/Plaints' legal counsels on December 30th, or on or before
23 **January 3, 2025, at 9:00 AM.**
24

25 For accountability and confirmation of receipt of this Petition and Notice of Appeal, I
26 request the following signatures from the leadership of the three branches of government,
27 their respective Inspectors General and my representatives and legal counsels:
28

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

Executive BranchPresident of the United States: Joseph R. Biden Jr.

Inspector General: _____

Judicial Branch

Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States:

John G. Roberts Jr.

Inspector General: _____

Legislative BranchSpeaker of the House of Representatives: Mike JohnsonPresident of the Senate: Kamala D. Harris

Inspector General: _____

Appellants'/Plaintiffs' Legal Representatives/Counsel(s): (If you received this Petition of Notice of Appeal, and you are required to sign, then you are considered to be my representative/legal counsel(s), please sign as receipt):

Michelle Kwok _____

Mary Markey _____

Rodney Hackney _____

Camille Stroughter _____

Wendy Torres _____

Ramon Leal _____

Phillip Talbert _____

Joseph Frueh _____

William Dean Carter _____

Carter Glahn _____

Y. Gutierrez ; M. Worthge ; Bryan T. eston

Thank you for your attention to this critical and urgent matter.

Dated this 30th day of December 2024.

Respectfully submitted,


El Sariqueño

Rene Ortiz, United States Marine, Combat Veteran

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Ortiz, et al.

9th Cir. Case No. 24-5645/24-4001
/24-1369

Appellant(s),

vs.

District Court or BAP
Case No. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR

Portfolio Recovery Associates LLC, et al. Appellee(s).

Supplement Page: Answers to questions on attached Form(s):

**Form 27. ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO/FROM
THE 9TH U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

Question # 1. What do you want the court to do?

(A) Petition Appellants' Appeal For Writ of Certiorari to SCOTUS

Question # 2. Why should the court do this? Be specific. Include all relevant facts and laws that would persuade the court to grant your request. (*Attached additional pages as necessary. Your motion may not be longer than 20 pages.*)

(A) The Court declines to review the Appeal, with an excuse and extortion of the Appellants to pay Court Fees, in the amount of \$605.00 and sign Court Forms.

I, Rene Ortiz, filed Submission(s) properly and in compliance with the FRCP and the Court(s) Local Rules and who were served with this Grievances against them, and all Submission(s) were in compliance with the FRCP, the Local Rules of each Court, and the U.S. Constitution. I certify under penalty of perjury the Courts, Defendants, Clerks of the

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 Court(s), Judge(s), Sr. Judge(s), Chief Judge(s), defense and U.S. Attorneys do not- did not!
2 read, review Rene Ortizs' submission(s) to the Court and closed, will close, or otherwise
3 dismiss Ortizs case(s) due to their misrepresentation(s), hearsay testimony and evidence, and
4 their misunderstanding of the Ortizs' case(s). Ortiz aggrivements against the Government(s)
5 employee(s) and its' Peoples' misrepresentation(s) of fact(s), opinion(s), evidence, and law(s);
6 their dereliction of duty is subject to criminal liability, and their breach of Oath of Office was
7 and is treacherous to the point of being charged with Misprision of Treason (*18 U.S. Code §*
8 *2382*) or Misprision of Felony (*18 U.S. Code § 4*). Their ineptness is approaching the point of
9 *Democratic chaos*, undermining workplace operations, leadership accountability, and the loss
10 of Public Trust.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

18
19 TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT
20 OF THE UNITED STATES:

21 Petitioner(s), Rene (PAG), Maria del Socorro, Andrew, and Ryun Ortiz, (the Ortizs)

22 respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant certiorari to review the decisions or lack
23 thereof of the 9th U.S. Court of Appeals and the lower Courts.
24

25 Petitioner(s) brings this appeal on the following grounds:
26
27
28

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the lower and Appellant Courts violate Petitioners' right to due process by dismissing and closing the case(s) based on hearsay testimony and evidence, and by allowing Respondents/the Court and/or Clerk of the Court to misrepresent themselves, their clients, and the issues at hand, to include the Court(s)?

2. Did the lower and Appellant Courts err in denying Petitioners the right to present the merits of their case, thereby depriving them of a fair and just hearing?

3. Did the lower and Appellant Courts err in rendering decisions without jurisdiction, contrary to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Henson v. Santander Consumer USA Inc.*, which exempts Santander from the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), allowing it to collect purchased debts outside the Act's standards and protections?

4. Are Respondents in violation of laws that prohibit (1a) duplication of benefits, (1b) the unlawful debt collection, (2) improper granting/denying of VA benefits, and (3) inaccuracies in credit reporting, and should these matters be heard fully to administer justice?

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions or decision(s) of the Eastern District Court, Sacramento, the U.S. District Court of Arizona, Tucson/Phoenix, and the 9th Court of Appeals, San Francisco, along with any related orders, are attached as appendices (the Courts will provide such evidence).

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction under *28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)* as this petition seeks review of a final judgment or the lack of thereof (closure of case(s)) by the 9th Court of Appeals, and lower Courts- that being the Eastern District of California, Sacramento and the U.S. District Court of Arizona- Tucson and Phoenix, which presents substantial questions about Federal rights and Constitutional protections.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioners filed suits in the Eastern District Court, Sacramento and the District Court of Arizona against Respondents for engaging in duplication of benefits, unlawful debt collection practices, unauthorized granting of VA benefits, and inaccuracies in credit reporting, the denial and interference of Ortiz to peacefully and patriotically participate in the Democratic process of running for the Oval Office, all of which materially harm Petitioners. The lower and Appellant Courts dismissed and closed the case based on unreliable hearsay evidence and

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 allowed Respondents to misrepresent key facts, parties, and issues, compromising the
2 integrity of the judicial process.

3
4 Petitioners contend that the lower and Appellant Courts lack jurisdiction to render any
5 decision on this matter due to the Supreme Court's decision in *Henson v. Santander Consumer*
6 *USA Inc.*, which established that Santander is not subject to the FDCPA as a debt collector
7 and may collect debts it has purchased without complying with the Act's standards.

8
9 On or about April 2020, Santander informed Petitioners that it had purchased an alleged
10 debt for which Petitioners were purportedly liable. In response, Petitioners exercised their
11 rights under 15 U.S.C. § 1692(g) of the FDCPA, requesting verification and validation of
12 the debt. Despite Petitioners' request, Santander provided no response, yet, on December 18,
13 2023, it seized Petitioners' property without notice or due process.

14
15
16
17 Petitioners warned Santander that any seizure of their property without compliance with
18 legal due process would be met with lawful forfeiture of Santander's interests, pursuant to
19 the RICO Act. The lower and Appellant Courts' refusal to grant a hearing to address these
20 issues, despite the continuing violations and harm inflicted on Petitioners, deprives
21 Petitioners of due process and equal protection under the law.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**1. Jurisdictional Overreach and Due Process Violation:**

Lower Courts are not vested with the authority to disregard or undermine a ruling by this Honorable Court, particularly in light of *Henson v. Santander*, which excludes Santander from FDCPA debt collection regulations. The lower and Appellant Courts' dismissals and closure of cases based on hearsay evidence and procedural irregularities contradict Petitioners' Constitutional due process rights and disregard binding Supreme Court precedent.

2. Ongoing Violations and Irreparable Harm:

Petitioners continue to experience harm as Respondents—including Santander—are in duplication of benefits, and thereafter engage in unlawful debt collection, improper handling of VA benefits, and inaccurate credit reporting; and violation of Ortiz to peacefully and patriotically participate in the Democratic process to be a viable POTUS candidate; By denying Petitioners a hearing, lower and Appellant Courts prevent redress for these violations. Petitioners are entitled to seek protection under the FDCPA, RICO Act and the U.S. Constitution to halt and remedy Respondents' continued unlawful activities.

3. Denial of Justice and Judicial Accountability:

Petitioners have a right to present their claims under applicable consumer protection and anti-racketeering laws. The failure of the lower and Appellant Courts to consider these claims

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 raises substantial concerns about judicial accountability and the administration of justice,
2 particularly as the ongoing harm persists.

3
4 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

5
6 WHEREFORE, Petitioners respectfully request that this Honorable Court:

7
8 1. Grant certiorari to review the decisions or lack thereof of the 9th Court of Appeals and
9 the lower Courts in this matter.

10
11 2. Order a hearing before an impartial Court to address the merits of Petitioners' claims,
12 including the enforcement of rights under the FDCPA and RICO Act, and the forfeiture of
13 Santander and other Respondents' interests due to continued unlawful practices.


14
15 3. Provide such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper of Initialing and
16 signing Appellants' Notice of Relief.

17
18
19 Thank you for your consideration and patience of our Petition, we hope you will respect our
20 Constitutional Right to petition the Government for redress of our Grievances, IAW the our
21 filed Step One IAW the Master Agreement between the VA & AFGE; Rene Ortiz's Request
22 Mast IAW the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and his Petition of Grievance(s) against the
23 Governments(s) IAW 1st Amendment of the United States Constitution.

24
25 Respectfully submitted this 30th day of December 2024.

26
27
28 Rene Ortiz

Name


Signature